



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,557	11/07/2001	Marcus Davidsson	042933/319585	3599
826	7590	08/16/2007	EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP			HUYNH, SON P	
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA				
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000			ART UNIT	
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			PAPER NUMBER	
			2623	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			08/16/2007	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/035,557	Applicant(s) DAVIDSSON, MARCUS	
	Examiner Son P. Huynh	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 36-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 36-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/20/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33, 36-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to Applicant's argument that none of the cited references discloses associating a user identifier with at least one new broadcast event entry, as recited, in one form or another, in amended independent claims 1, 10, 15, 25 (page 13, paragraph 2), the Examiner respectfully traversed.

Art Unit: 2623

Barnett discloses the user logs onto the calendaring system by providing unique logging name and password that identifies the user and allows the system to retrieve that user's personal calendar and associated information. Once the user has logged in, the user can enter any of several different areas of the system, in order to perform different types of activities including adding new event into user's personal calendar. Users can develop their own event categories and share them with other users (see include, but are not limited to, col. 3, lines 1-45, col. 7, lines 51-64). User cache 109, which provides temporary storage of personal calendar information for particular users (col. 6, lines 10-15). The user can also specify that he or she would like to be notified when an event is about to occur, either by e-mail or by some other communications means (see include, but are not limited to, col. 3, lines 56-60). Thus, a user identifier (e.g., login name, or password, or user information for receiving notification when an event is about to occurs) must be associated with at least one new broadcast event entry (e.g., Berkeley vs. Stanford) so that the user (or users associated with the previous entry event) is notified when the event is about to occur, or the previous added event entry in the user's personal calendar is displayed when the user has logged in.

Alternatively, Ellis (US 2005/0283810 A1) also discloses associating a user identifier with at least one new broadcast entry event (associating user identifier, or user name with new at least one new broadcast event entry in recording list – see include, but are not limited to, figures 4-5, 18f, 27, paragraphs 0081-0082, 0087, 0142).

Art Unit: 2623

For the reasons given above, rejections on claims 1-33, 36-40 are analyzed as follow.

Claims 34-35 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 9, 15-21, 24-28, 30-31, 36-38, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proehl et al. (US 6,532,589 – herein after referred to as '589) in view of Barnett et al. (US 6,369,840 B1) –hereinafter referred to as Barnett.

Regarding claim 1, '589 discloses a method comprising:

accessing an electronic program guide, the electronic program guide listing a plurality of scheduled broadcast programs and comprising information associated with each of the plurality of scheduled broadcast program (interpreted as generating an electronic program guide (EPG), the EPG listing a plurality of scheduled broadcast programs such as programs to be broadcast in future, pay per view programs, etc.,

Art Unit: 2623

each program comprises information such as program title, channel, broadcast time, etc. – see col. 5, lines 5-62, col. 6, line 47-col. 7, line 23, figures 1, 5, 7-8);

displaying the accessed electronic program guide on the electronic display (interpreted as displaying EPG on the monitor screen – see include, but are not limited to, figures 1, 7-8).

'589 further discloses selecting at least one of the plurality of scheduled broadcast program in the accessed electronic program guide (interpreted as selecting a program on the EPG screen for watch, recording, or set a reminder – see figures 1, 8, col. 6, line 55-col. 7, line 23).

'589 also discloses the TV planner allows the user to easily view and understand the schedule of selected TV activity, include timer schedule events, events scheduled for recording, and scheduled pay per view selections, broadcast events, etc. The TV planner has a plurality of entries (e.g. boxes for July 17 – figures 9-10), each broadcast event entry containing information for a corresponding selected program (e.g. program title, channel, time) being stored in the TV planner at a time corresponding to broadcast time of the selected program – see figures 9-10, col. 8, lines 11-20). However, '589 does not explicitly disclose the information of the selected broadcast program is transferred to the TV planner as at least one new event entry, associating a user identifier with the at least one new event entry.

Barnett discloses transferring information, associated with the at least one selected broadcast program to the accessed electronic calendar as at least one new entry (transferring information such as Berkeley vs. Stanford, or San Francisco 49er vs.

Art Unit: 2623

New Orleans Saints, etc. from the event directory, or favorite event to the electronic calendar when the user check the box of the event and "Add" icon to add the information as new broadcast event entry – see include, but are not limited to, figures 7a-13).

Barnett also discloses the user logs onto the calendaring system by providing unique login name and password that identifies the user and allows the system to retrieve that user's personal calendar and associated information. Once the user has logged in, the user can enter any of several different areas of the system, in order to perform different types of activities including adding new event into user's personal calendar. Users can develop their own event categories and share them with other users (see include, but are not limited to, col. 3, lines 1-45, col. 7, lines 51-64). User cache 109, which provides temporary storage of personal calendar information for particular users (col. 6, lines 10-15). The user can also specify that he or she would like to be notified when an event is about to occur, either by e-mail or by some other communications means (see include, but are not limited to, col. 3, lines 56-60). Thus, a user identifier (e.g., login name, or password, or user information for receiving notification when an event is about to occurs) must be associated with at least one new broadcast event entry (e.g., Berkeley vs. Stanford) so that the user (or users associated with the previous entry event) is notified when the event is about to occur, or the previous added event entry in the user's personal calendar is displayed when the user has logged in.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify '589 to use the teaching as taught by Barnett in order to at least minimize the errors (col. 1, lines 51-67) or to allow a higher level of flexibility in the way events can be imported and viewed (see include, but are not limited to, col. 2, lines 25-48, col. 13, lines 39-47).

Regarding claim 38, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. '589 further discloses accessing an electronic calendar, the electronic calendar being capable of storing a plurality of event entries at a plurality of times, the electronic calendar configured to store broadcast event entries related to scheduled broadcast programs (interpreted as accessing calendar-based television planner (herein after referred to as TV planner), from an electronic program guide. The TV planner capable of storing a plurality of event entries related to scheduled broadcast programs at a plurality of times such as remind, record, pay per view, etc. of programs at different times on the TV planner – see col. 7, line 6-col. 8, line 60, figures 7-10);

displaying the accessed electronic calendar on an electronic display (interpreted as displaying TV planner on monitor screen – figures 1, 7, 9-10; col. 7, line 6-col. 8, line 60).

Barnett further discloses the electronic calendar configured to store broadcast event entries related to scheduled broadcast programs (e.g., Berkeley vs. Stanford, or San Francisco 49ers vs. New Orleans Saints, etc. – see include, but are not limited to, figures 12-13) and user-generated event entries related to scheduled non-broadcast-

Art Unit: 2623

related event for at least one user (e.g., Lunch with Rebecca, or weekly 1-1 w/James/weekly status meeting – see include, but are not limited to, figures 12-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify '589 to use the teaching as further taught by Barnett in order to expand utilizations of the electronic calendar.

Regarding claim 2, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 38. '589 further discloses TV planner is accessed from electronic program guide (col. 7, lines 1-66) and once the viewer selects a particular program (e.g. record/purchase), the viewer can display TV planner on the screen without electronic program guide (figures 8-10). Thus, the electronic program guide is removed from the display upon selection of the at least one of the plurality of broadcast program (interpreted as after the viewer selects a program on the electronic program guide to purchase/record/or remind, the TV planner can be displayed on the screen (without the electronic program guide) and allows viewer to view the activities – see figures 9-10). '589 also discloses the TV planner comprises return button returns a user to home, or the last screen that they were viewing prior to entering the TV planner (col. 8, lines 3-10), the TV planner also comprises go to guide button that take the viewer to the electronic program guide (col. 8, lines 3-60). It is obvious that a portion of the displayed electronic calendar (TV planner) is replaced on the display by the electronic program guide when the electronic program guide is access (e.g. press EPG key on the remote

Art Unit: 2623

control – col. 5, lines 20-35, or select “go to guide button” on the TV planner) so that the viewer can see the information on the program guide easily.

Alternatively, Barnett further discloses at least a portion of the displayed electronic calendar is replaced on the display by the electronic programming guide when the electronic program guide is accessed (e.g., when the calendar is displayed and the user select “Event directory” icon, or “Favorite icon”, a lists of items associated with the selected Event Directory icon, or Favorite Events icon replace the calendar – see include, but are not limited to, figures 7a-13), and the electronic program guide is remove from the display upon selection of the at least one of the plurality of broadcast programs (the user selects a broadcast program (e.g. event 903) to add into the calendar and then view the calendar – see include, but are not limited to, figures 7a-13).

Regarding claim 3, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. The additional limitation of “the scheduled broadcast program listed in the electronic program guide are television programs” is interpreted as broadcast programs displayed on the EPG are television programs such as movies, news, sports, etc. (see '589, col. 5, line 34-col. 6, line 7, col. 6, line 61-col. 7, line 23; or see Barnett, figures 6-11).

Regarding claim 4, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 3. The additional limitation of “the information transferred from the electronic program guide to the calendar comprises at least one of a name, start time,

Art Unit: 2623

duration, and channel number of the corresponding at least one selected television program" (see '589, figure 10, or Barnett, figures 7a-13).

Regarding claim 5, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 3. Barnett further discloses the information transferred comprises an identification (e.g. title, time, etc.) of the at least one selected broadcast program (see figures 8-13).

Regarding claim 6, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. The additional limitation of "displaying one of a reminder and recording icon in the electronic calendar when a broadcast program for which broadcast event entry has been stored in the electronic calendar is tagged for one of a reminder and a recording function, respectively) is met by displaying "remind" icon or "record" icon in the calendar month/day when a broadcast program is selected for reminding or for recording – see '589, figures 9-10, col. 8, lines 10-60).

Regarding claim 9, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. '589 further discloses a remote control that allow user to select programs through the electronic program guide – col. 5, lines 30-35); a cursor 928 is displayed as a box outlining a day of the TV planner, and the cursor 928 is under control of the user via the remote device; the cursor is used to select the day view TV planner (col. 8, lines 25-30).

Alternatively, Barnett also discloses selecting at least one of the plurality of scheduled broadcast programs in the accessed electronic programming guide comprises highlighting a listing in the accessed electronic programming guide corresponding to the at least one selected program (e.g. user checks the icon associated with the program – see include, but are not limited to, figures 8-11).

Regarding claim 15, the limitations of a multimedia device correspond to the limitations of the method as claimed in claim 1, and are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claim 1, wherein “data storage device...” is read on any storage device/user program record/purchase database that stores an TV planner (see ‘589, figures 2, col. 4, line 58-col. 5, line 15, col. 7, line 1-22, figures 8-10) or alternatively is read on database servers layer that stores electronic calendar information (see Barnett, figures 1-2), the “first accessing component configured to access the electronic calendar...” is read on demultiplexer or access device connected memory/database that stored TV planner (see ‘589 include, but not limited to, figures 2, 8-10), or alternatively read on component configured to access calendar information (see include, but are not limited to, Barnett, figures 1-2), “second accessing component...” is read on demultiplexer, SRAM 36, IC 34 that access program guide data (see ‘589, col. 5, lines 1-15, lines 37-62) or alternatively read on the component configured to access event directory, favorite event (see Barnett, include, but are not limited to, figures 1-2, 7a-7b), “a processor coupled to the first and second accessing means and the data storage device...” is interpreted as CPU coupled to data buffer 51, demultiplexer, DRAM, EEPROM, ROM, DRAM, etc. for

Art Unit: 2623

control processing to the data and performs functions according to command input by the user (see '589, figures 2, 8-10, col. 4, line 58-col. 5, line 15; col. 6, lines 7-53).

Regarding claim 16, '589 in view of Barnett discloses an apparatus as discussed in the rejection of claim 15. '589 further discloses output means for generating a video output signal capable of driving a monitor (interpreted as demultiplexer, MPEG 25, NTSC 27 for generating a video output signal to a monitor 4 – figures 1-2,7-8, col. 4, lines 33-44; col. 5, lines 1-15), the video output signal being capable of displaying on the monitor the electronic calendar and the electronic program guide (interpreted as output signal capable of displaying on the monitor screen the TV planner and the television program guide – figures 7-10).

Regarding claims 17-21 and 24, the additional limitation of the multimedia device correspond to the additional limitations of the method as claimed in claims 2-6, 9, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claims 2-6 and 9.

Regarding claim 25, the limitations of the apparatus as claimed correspond to the limitations of the method of claim 1 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 15.

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding claims 26-28, the additional limitations as claimed correspond to the additional limitations as claimed in claims 18-19, 21 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claims 18-19, 21

Regarding claims 30-31, the additional limitation "accessing the electronic programming guide comprises accessing the electronic programming guide from the electronic calendar by selecting an icon from the electronic calendar" is read on selecting "return" or "go to guide" in TV planner (see '589, figures 9-10) or is alternatively read on selecting Favorite Event icon, or Event directory icon of the Calendar – see Barnett, figures 12-13).

Regarding claim 36, '589 in view of Barnett discloses an apparatus as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Barnett further discloses automatically associating a user identifier with at least one new broadcast event entry (e.g., using login name, password, or user identifier in user profile – see discussion in rejection of claim 1 and col. 17, lines 1-5, col. 20, lines 12-19, col. 21, lines 20-23, col. 22, lines 30-39).

Regarding claim 37, '589 in view of Barnett discloses an apparatus as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Barnett further discloses transferring information to an electronic calendar as at least one new broadcast event entry includes selecting at least one of the plurality of scheduled broadcast programs in the accessed electronic programming guide (e.g., selecting Berkeley vs. Stanford from the Grid), and thereby transferring

Art Unit: 2623

information as at least one new broadcast event entry to an electronic calendar that is integrated with the electronic programming guide (see include, but are not limited to, figures 7a-13).

Regarding claim 40, the additional limitation of the apparatus that correspond to the additional limitations of the method of claim are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 38.

5. Claims 7, 22, 29, 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proehl in view of Barnett as applied to claim 1, 15 or 25 above, and further in view of Ellis et al. (US 2005/0283810 A1).

Regarding claim 7, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. '589 further discloses an entry has been stored in the electronic calendar is tagged for one of a reminder and a recording function, respectively (figures 9-10). However, neither reference specifically disclose the entry has been stored is tagged in the electronic program guide.

Ellis disclose an entry has been stored is tagged in the electronic program guide for a recording function (interpreted as program selected to be recorded is tagged so that the programs selected to be recorded displayed with an icon, different color, a different font, etc. indicating them as to be recorded – see paragraphs 0125 –0126, figures 11a-11c). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2623

at the time the invention was made to modify '589 in view of Barnett with the teaching as taught by Ellis in order to allow user to identify the program selected to be recorded in the program guide.

Regarding claims 22 and 29, the additional limitations of the multimedia device as claimed correspond to the additional limitations of method as claimed 7, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 7.

Regarding claim 32, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. '589 further discloses the selecting at least one of the plurality of scheduled broadcast programs in the accessed electronic programming guide includes selecting a plurality of scheduled broadcast programs respectively associated with multiple users (e.g., selecting a plurality of scheduled broadcast programs in EPG, wherein the programs in EPG are scheduled to provide to multiple users – see include, but are not limited to, figures 1, 9-10, col. 3, line 51-col. 4, line 17). Barnett discloses transferring information respectively associated with each of the plurality selected broadcast programs (e.g., Berkeley vs. Stanford, San Francisco 49ers vs. New Orleans Saints, etc.) to an electronic calendar as multiple new broadcast event entries, and associating a user identifier with the at least one new event entry (see discussion in the rejection of claim 1, and figure 9). However, '589 in view of Barnett does not explicitly disclose associating respective user identifiers with corresponding ones of the multiple new broadcast event entries.

Ellis discloses associating a user identifier with at least one new broadcast event entry includes associating respective user identifier with corresponding ones of the multiple new broadcast event entries (e.g., associating user identifier, or user name with at least one new broadcast event entry in the schedule recording lists includes associating respective user identifiers with corresponding ones of the multiple new broadcast event entry with selected programs – see include, but are not limited to, figures 4-5, 18f, 27, paragraphs 0081-0082, 0087, 0142). Therefore, it would have been obvious with one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify '589 in view of Barnett with the teaching as taught by Ellis in order to keep track of programs accessed by users easily.

Regarding claim 33, the additional limitations as claimed correspond to the additional limitations as claimed in claim 32, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 32.

6. Claims 8, 10-14, 23, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proehl et al. (US 6,532,589 – herein after referred to as '589) in view of Barnett et al. (US 6,369,840), and further in view of Yuen et al. (6,430,359).

Regarding claim 8, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Barnett also discloses a search field (not shown) is provided to

Art Unit: 2623

allow interactive searching of the event directory (col. 10, lines 11-12). However, '589 in view of Barnett does not specifically disclose entering a code for a selected program, the code uniquely identifying the selected program.

Yuen discloses selecting program in the electronic program guide comprises entering a code for a selected program, the code uniquely identifying the selected program (interpreted as select a program comprises entering compressed code or G-code, the compressed code or G-code uniquely identifying the selected program – see include, but not limited to, col. 16, lines 5-41, figure 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify '589 in view of Barnett to use the teaching as taught by Yuen in order to enter information of selected program simpler, faster and less error-prone (see col. 2, lines 24-31).

Regarding claim 23, the additional limitations of the multimedia device as claimed correspond to the additional limitations of the method as claimed in claim 8, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 8.

Regarding claim 10, the method as claimed is broader than the method as claimed in claims 1 and 8. Therefore, the limitations that correspond to the limitations of claims 1 and 8 are analyzed as discussed with rejection of claims 1 and 8.

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding claims 11-13, the additional limitations as claimed correspond to the additional limitations as claims in claims 3-4, 6, and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claims 3-4, 6.

Regarding claim 14, '589 in view of Barnett discloses a method as discussed in the rejection of claim 13. '589 further discloses an entry has been stored in the electronic calendar is tagged for one of a reminder and a recording function, respectively (figures 9-10). However, neither reference specifically disclose the entry has been stored is tagged in the electronic program guide. Official Notice is taken that entry of selected program is tagged in an electronic program guide is well known in the art. For example, on an electronic program guide, displaying program selected to be recorded with an icon, different color, or different font to allow the selected program to be identified. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify '589 in view of Barnett and Yuen with the well-known teaching in the art in order to allow user to identify the program selected to be recorded in the program guide.

Regarding claim 39, the additional limitations that correspond to the additional limitation of claim 38 are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 38.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ellis et al. (US 2006/0140584 A1) discloses system and methods for interactive program guides with personal video recording features.

Adler et al. (US 6,249,765 B1) discloses associating a user identifier with event entry in electronic calendar (figure 12).

Yuen (US 6,137,950) discloses bar code matrix television calendar.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son P. Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-7295. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Son P. Huynh

August 15, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Son P. Huynh', with a long horizontal stroke extending from the bottom of the signature.